

REMARKS

Claims 1, 9-11, 14, 16 and 17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 14 and 17 are amended to recite additional features disclosed in the specification at, for example, Fig. 4. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 9, 11, 14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,452,653 to Yamanaka ("Yamanaka I"); and rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamanaka I in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,873,384 to Yamanaka et al. ("Yamanaka II"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 14 and 17 are amended, as outlined above. The applied references do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in the claims.

The Office Action asserts that Yamanaka I discloses all elements recited in claims 1, 14 and 17. In particular, the Office Action asserts that Fig. 24b of Yamanaka I discloses a single, "huge" pixel, and asserts that Yamanaka I discloses the features recited in claim 1 in view of the huge pixel of Yamanaka I. However, these assertions are without merit.

First, it is unreasonable for the Office Action to assert that Fig. 24b discloses a huge pixel. In fact, Yamanaka I explicitly states that what is disclosed in Fig. 24b is a display screen. See col. 34, lines 14-28.

In fact, the Office Action (see page 6, the last paragraph) recognizes that Fig. 28 of Yamanaka I discloses that each region 102 corresponds to one pixel (see Yamanaka I at col. 36, lines 32-49). Fig. 28 of Yamanaka I illustrates a display having a plurality of regions 102. Thus, the display screen in Fig. 24b of Yamanaka I contains a plurality of regions (pixels), and cannot be understood to correspond to a huge, single pixel. One of ordinary skill in the art would not have regarded a display screen as one huge pixel. Thus, the Office Action is unreasonably reading the disclosure of Yamanaka I.

Furthermore, for the sake of argument, even if Yamanaka I's display screen may be interpreted as a single, huge pixel, Yamanaka I does not disclose or suggest that at least two types of different irregularity groups are disposed within a single pixel in plan view, where the at least two types of different irregularity groups have different shapes or sizes, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 14 and 17. For example, in the annotated Fig. 24b of Yamanaka I enclosed in the Office Action, all asserted irregularity groups I-IV have identical square shape and size. Thus, even in the annotated Fig. 24b of Yamanaka I, there is no disclosure of two types of different irregularity groups having different shapes or sizes.

Additionally, even if Yamanaka I's display screen may be interpreted as a single, huge pixel (which is not reasonable), Yamanaka I cannot be read as to disclose "pixels juxtaposed at the pixel pitch," as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 14 and 17, because Yamanaka I discloses only one single, huge pixel, as asserted in the Office Action. There are no other pixels to juxtapose with this single, huge pixel. Thus, even if Yamanaka I's disclosure is interpreted in the way the Office Action asserts, Yamanaka I still does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 14 and 17.

For any or all of the above reasons, Yamanaka I does not disclose or suggest each and every element recited in claims 1, 14 and 17. Also, Yamanaka II does not supply the subject matter lacking in Yamanaka I. Thus, Yamanaka I and Yamanaka II, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1, 14 and 17, and claims 9-11 and 16 depending therefrom. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 9-11, 14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 9-11, 14, 16 and 17 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GXL/lmf

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: April 24, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--